language in claims 76, 78, 80, 82, and 84 does not contradict the language of the independent claims from which they depend. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 76, 78, 80, 82, and 84 should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102(a) Rejection

Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21, 23-31, 33-37, 39, 41-50, 52-60, 62, 64-72, 74, 75, 77, 79, 81, 83, and 85-88 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Lemay et al. "Teach Yourself Java 2 in 21 Days" ("Lemay"). Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because, as discussed in detail in the Reply filed June 6, 2006, Lemay fails to describe or suggest at least "preventing a user from perceiving the content while the indicator is being presented", as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in each of independent claims 23, 42, 52, and 64.

In paragraph 5 of the pending office action, the Examiner notes that entire face of the select tag in Lemay can function as an indicator. Applicant does not dispute this observation. Indeed, even if the entire face of the select tag of Lemay were considered an indicator, Lemay would still fail to describe or suggest preventing a user from perceiving the pull-down list while the entire face of the select tag is being presented. In Lemay's system, a user is never <u>prevented from perceiving</u> the pull-down list <u>while the entire face</u> of the select tag <u>is being presented</u>. Rather, a user has full access to the pull-down list while the face of the select tag is being presented. <u>See</u> Lemay at Figure 11.7, showing that the user is actually perceiving the pull-down list (Items "Less than 1", "1.2", "3.4") while the face ("Choose One") of the select tag is being presented to the user.

The Examiner also suggests in paragraph 5 of the pending office action that the limitation "preventing a user from perceiving the content while the indicator is being presented" is somehow diluted or modified by the rest of the claim, stating that "In view of the claims as a whole, these independent claims do not suggest that the indicator is not being present when the use perceives the content." Specifically, the Examiner is trying to dilute or modify the limitation by suggesting that other language in the claim actually suggests that the indicator is presented when the user perceives the content, stating that "the limitation 'preventing the user from capturing the content and preventing a perception of the content *at the indicator* whenever the

user attempts to capture the content' ... suggests that the indicator is being presented when the user perceives the content.[Emphasis original]" Applicant disagrees and requests that the Examiner not draw improper inferences from the claim language. While the claim requires that perception of the content at the indicator is prevented whenever the user attempts to capture the content, there is nothing in this language to suggest that the indicator is somehow presented when the content is perceived. The language merely points out that the content is not perceived under certain circumstances. The language "at the indicator" does not require the presence of the indicator at the time that the content is perceived, nor does it require the presence of the indicator at any specific time. The language "at the indicator" merely points out that the indicator is at a location, and the language was inserted to merely point out where the perception of content is prevented.

For at least these additional reasons, claims 1, 23, 42, 52, and 64, and their dependent claims, are allowable over Lemay.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-17, 21, 23-25, 30, 31, 33-35, 39, 41-44, 49, 50, 52-60, 62, 64-72, 74, and 76-88

Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-17, 21, 23-25, 30, 31, 33-35, 39, 41-44, 49, 50, 52-60, 62, 64-72, 74, and 76-88 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,032,150 (Nguyen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,843 (Gelfer). Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because, as discussed in detail in the Reply filed June 6, 2006, Nguyen and Gelfer, either alone or in combination, fail to remedy the failure of Lemay to describe or suggest at least "preventing a user from perceiving the content while the indicator is being presented", as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in each of independent claims 23, 42, 52, and 64.

The Examiner argues in paragraph 6 of the pending office action that Nguyen somehow discloses that a user is prevented from perceiving content while an indicator is being presented. The Examiner points to col. 3, lines 11-39 of Nguyen and states that when "the indicator is presented (the graphical element and first region surrounding the first element), the presentation of the graphical element in further detail is prevented unless a server allows permission based on

a unique id and a set of conditions." While it is true that the user must await permission to see the detailed graphical element, the user is not prevented from perceiving the detailed graphical element <u>while the thumbnail graphical element is being presented</u>. Indeed, the user can perceive the detailed graphical element even though the thumbnail graphical element is being presented.

Furthermore, Nguyen also fails to describe or suggest preventing the user from capturing the content and preventing a perception of the content at the indicator whenever the user attempts to capture the content, as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in each of independent claims 23, 42, 52, and 64. In Nguyen, the user is not prevented from capturing the detailed graphical element and the user is not prevented from perceiving the detailed graphical element <u>whenever the user attempts to capture the detailed graphical element</u>. Rather, as Nguyen describes and as the Examiner concedes, the user is able to perceive and capture the detailed graphical element at certain times even though the user attempts to capture it. Nguyen explains that there are certain conditions under which the user will be able to capture and/ore perceive the detailed graphical element. <u>See</u> Nguyen at col. 1, lines 62-66. Moreover, while Nguyen's applet 124 may sometimes prevent the user from printing the detailed graphical element (after allowing the user to perceive the detailed graphical element), Nguyen's applet is not configured to also prevent the user from perceiving the detailed graphical element when the user attempts to print the detailed graphical element. <u>See</u> Nguyen at col. 3, lines 40-65.

Gelfer is not relied upon to teach the above-noted features, nor does Gelfer contemplate the above-note features. Gelfer generally relates to improving the security of postage meter machines by operating a security flag and fails to describe or suggest at least "preventing a user from perceiving the content while the indicator is being presented" and "preventing the user from capturing the content and preventing a perception of the content at the indicator whenever the user attempts to capture the content", as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in each of independent claims 23, 42, 52, and 64.

Accordingly, Nguyen and Gelfer, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest "preventing a user from perceiving the content while the indicator is being presented" and "preventing the user from capturing the content and preventing a perception of the content at the indicator whenever the user attempts to capture the content", as recited in claim 1 and

similarly recited in independent claim 23, 42, 52, and 64. For at least these additional reasons, claims 1, 23, 42, 52, and 64, and their dependent claims, are allowable over Nguyen and Gelfer.

Claims 4-7, 18-20, 26-29, 36-38, 45-48, 61, and 73

Claims 4-7, 18-20, 26-29, 36-38, 45-48, 61, and 73 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Nguyen in view of Gelfer and Lemay. These claims depend from independent claims 1, 23, 42, 52, and 64, which were rejected as being anticipated by Lemay, and as being obvious over Nguyen in view of Gelfer. As discussed above, neither Nguyen nor Gelfer remedies the failure of Lemay to describe or suggest "preventing a user from perceiving the content while the indicator is being presented", as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 23, 42, 52, and 64. Thus, Nguyen, Gelfer, and Lemay, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest "preventing a user from perceiving the content while the indicator is being presented". For at least these reasons, claims 1, 23, 42, 52, and 64 are allowable over Nguyen, Gelfer, and Lemay.

Moreover, as also discussed above, Nguyen and Gelfer, alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest "preventing the user from capturing the content and preventing a perception of the content at the indicator whenever the user attempts to capture the content", as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 23, 42, 52, and 64. And, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Nguyen to provide this feature based on the teachings of Lemay.

Accordingly, claims 4-7, 18-20, 26-29, 36-38, 45-48, 61, and 73 depend from independent claims 1, 23, 42, 52, and 64, and are allowable for at least the reasons that their respective independent claim is allowable, and for containing allowable subject matter in their own right.

For example, as applicant discussed in the Reply filed June 6, 2006, it would not have been obvious to modify Nguyen with the features of Lemay to obtain the limitations of claim 4, which recites that the indicator includes text that presents the user with instructions for operating an input device to perceive the content when a graphical interface tool is positioned over the indicator. The Examiner appears to think it is enough to show that Lemay describes providing written instructions as motivation to modify Nguyen in the manner suggested. Lemay's

description provides, at most, motivation to provide written instructions in the Choice List menu to perceive content in the Choice List. However, without some further suggestion found in Lemay to provide such instructions in a program applet in which content is being protected, that is, where a user is prevented from perceiving content when an indicator is being presented, Lemay lacks the requisite motivation to modify Nguyen.

Claims 22, 40, 63, and 75

Claims 22, 40, 63, and 75 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Nguyen in view of Gelfer and "Video on the World Wide Web Accessing Video from WWW Browsers" by Huseby (Huseby). Claims 22, 40, 63, and 75 depend from independent claims 1, 23, 42, 52, and 64, which were rejected as being obvious over Nguyen in view of Gelfer. As discussed above, neither Nguyen nor Gelfer describes or suggests the subject matter of claims 1, 23, 42, 52, and 64. Moreover, as previously discussed in the Reply filed June 6, 2006, Huseby also fails to remedy the shortcomings of Nguyen and Gelfer to describe or suggest at least "preventing a user from perceiving the content while the indicator is being presented", as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in each of independent claims 23, 42, 52, and 64. For these reasons, independent claims 1, 23, 42, 52, and 64 are allowable over any possible combination of Nguyen, Gelfer, and Huseby. Claims 22, 40, 63, and 75 are allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claims are allowable.

It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this filing. Nevertheless, please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:September 26, 2006

/Diana DiBerardino/
Diana DiBerardino
Reg. No. 45,653

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40369152.doc